Universal Salvation with an Exception Clause: Rethinking Judgment, Knowledge, and the "Born Again" Paradox

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

January 15, 2026

This paper explores a provocative theological hypothesis: that universal salvation might apply to all souls *except* those who, having claimed to be "born again," reject the responsibilities such knowledge entails. Drawing from James 3:1 and Luke 12:48, the study examines the possibility that the very act of proclaiming deep spiritual awareness may expose a soul to stricter judgment if it fails to align with the corresponding moral demands. The framework challenges both traditional Calvinist "Perseverance of the Saints" (the P in TULIP) and contemporary universalist theologies by suggesting that those with the clearest light may be uniquely capable of self-condemnation—not through sin alone, but through spiritual presumption. We review patristic, scriptural, and moral-theological resources to frame this exception not as a threat, but as a radical call to humility, responsibility, and transformation. What emerges is a vision of divine justice that is neither arbitrary nor lax, but profoundly personal and proportionate to knowledge.

Keywords: universal salvation, born again, judgment, James 3:1, Luke 12:48, TULIP, perseverance, Calvinism, exception clause, moral knowledge, divine justice, spiritual responsibility.

A collaboration with GPT-4o. 30 pages. CC4.0.

Note: My father, Charles F. Youvan is acknowledged posthumously for originating the foundational idea behind this paper. While he did not contribute to the manuscript's writing, his theological reflections and lifelong inquiry into grace and accountability directly shaped its argument.

Outline

1. Introduction: A New Hypothesis in Eschatology

- 1.1 A universalist framework with an inversion: the saved majority
- 1.2 Why "Born Again" individuals might be uniquely judged
- 1.3 Preview of theological tensions explored

2. Scriptural Anchors: Judgment Proportional to Knowledge

- 2.1 James 3:1 and the burden of teachers
- 2.2 Luke 12:48 and the principle of differentiated accountability
- 2.3 Paul on conscience, light, and responsibility

3. Theological Background: TULIP and Its Cracks

- 3.1 Perseverance of the Saints and the assumed guarantee
- 3.2 Election, agency, and spiritual presumption
- 3.3 What happens when "saving knowledge" is misused?

4. Universal Salvation Revisited

- 4.1 What traditional universalism claims—and omits
- 4.2 Patristic precedents: Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Isaac of Nineveh
- 4.3 The line between hope and inevitability

5. The Exception Clause: A Theological Proposal

- 5.1 Defining the exception: spiritual knowledge without transformation
- 5.2 Why rejecting mercy knowingly might be self-condemning
- 5.3 A paradox of enlightenment: the light that judges

6. Implications for Repentance and Responsibility

- 6.1 What true repentance entails post-awakening
- 6.2 Moral seriousness vs spiritual performance
- 6.3 The temptation to claim certainty without the cross

7. Christological and Pneumatological Reflections

- 7.1 The Spirit's role in convicting, not coercing
- 7.2 Christ as judge who knows the heart's awareness
- 7.3 The danger of blasphemy against the Spirit reinterpreted

8. The Born-Again Risk: Not for the World, but the Church

- 8.1 Evangelism and the weight of what we proclaim
- 8.2 Not everyone who says "Lord, Lord..."
- 8.3 The narrowing gate of moral clarity

9. Reconsidering Hell: As Refusal, Not Sentence

- 9.1 What if Hell is only possible after full light?
- 9.2 The justice of God as proportionate, not punitive
- 9.3 The "final no": who is capable of it?

10. Conclusion: Toward a Theology of Merciful Gravity

- 10.1 Rethinking spiritual privilege and eschatological risk
- 10.2 Discipleship as costly knowledge
- 10.3 Final remarks on judgment, love, and hope

11. References

- Scriptural citations, Patristic sources, modern theological works, universalist and Calvinist texts, analytic theology on divine justice and personhood

Art

Charles F. Youvan is acknowledged posthumously for originating the foundational idea behind this paper. While he did not contribute to the manuscript's writing, his theological reflections and lifelong inquiry into grace and accountability directly shaped its argument.

1. Introduction: A New Hypothesis in Eschatology

The doctrine of universal salvation has long stirred theological imagination and controversy—promising a vision of God's mercy vast enough to encompass all souls. Traditionally, its challengers point to warnings of judgment, the moral seriousness of sin, and the role of freedom. But what if these very warnings had a more radical target? What if the danger was not to the outsider, the unevangelized, or the rebellious sinner, but to those who claim *spiritual insight*—especially the "Born Again"? This paper proposes a rare inversion: that under a universalist framework, it is precisely those who claim to know the light who stand in greatest danger of eschatological loss—not because they are less loved, but because they are more accountable.

This is not a rejection of universal salvation, but a mutation. It suggests that if God's mercy ultimately extends to all, then judgment does not vanish—it intensifies where moral and spiritual clarity are highest. Those who presume salvation because of their profession of faith may in fact be closer to judgment, not farther from it. The warnings of James 3:1 and Luke 12:48—about teachers and stewards—become not side notes, but interpretive keys.

This introduction frames the core hypothesis and previews the theological terrain we will explore.

1.1 A Universalist Framework with an Inversion: The Saved Majority

Most universalist theologies begin with the affirmation that God desires the salvation of all and has acted decisively in Christ to reconcile creation. If this is true—and if it succeeds—then the vast majority of human beings, regardless of their culture, religion, or moral failings, will ultimately be healed, forgiven, and drawn into the divine life. This includes the ignorant, the resistant, and the overtly wicked, though their journey may be long and purgative. The arc bends toward mercy.

But herein lies the inversion: if *everyone* is eventually saved, what happens to the distinctive moral weight carried by those who *claim to know* God already—those who call themselves "Born Again"? If judgment is proportional to light received, then these individuals may bear a weight others do not. Under this view, universal salvation does not eliminate judgment—it shifts its focus. Instead of condemning the outsider, judgment scrutinizes the insider. This inversion takes seriously the paradox that proximity to truth is not always a blessing, but sometimes a burden.

Thus, the "saved majority" includes the outsider. The question becomes: who, in a world where mercy triumphs, still stands at risk—and why?

1.2 Why "Born Again" Individuals Might Be Uniquely Judged

To be "Born Again" is not simply to have had a spiritual experience. It is to make a claim—to oneself, to others, and to God—that one has received divine light, passed through death to life, and entered a covenant of transformation. This claim carries with it a theological, ethical, and existential consequence: accountability.

James 3:1 warns that "teachers will be judged more strictly." Luke 12:48 states that "to whom much is given, much will be required." These verses suggest a principle of judgment not based on status or label but on *received knowledge* and *entrusted responsibility*. If the Born Again believer has encountered the Gospel in fullness, and yet chooses hypocrisy, manipulation, or spiritual pride, they may be uniquely exposed to the most severe form of judgment—not despite their profession of faith, but because of it.

This view does not negate grace; it amplifies the moral *cost* of grace misused. In this light, Hell—if it exists—is not the punishment of the ignorant, but the self-destruction of those who turned divine knowledge into self-righteousness, weaponry, or presumption. Thus, the Born Again believer is not exempt from judgment, but its possible focal point.

1.3 Preview of Theological Tensions Explored

This inversion of judgment raises several theological tensions that this paper will trace across scripture, tradition, and moral reasoning:

- Soteriological Tension: Can a universalist framework accommodate real judgment? If all are saved, what is the meaning of warning, punishment, and moral gravity?
- Anthropological Tension: Can human beings with full knowledge of grace still reject it? If so, is that rejection freely chosen or metaphysically impossible?
- Ecclesial Tension: What happens to Christian identity if the greatest spiritual peril belongs not to the outsider but to the insider?
- Calvinist Tension: How would this hypothesis rewrite the P in TULIP—Perseverance of the Saints—into something like Peril of the Professing?
- Pastoral Tension: Can this model sustain both mercy for the masses and moral seriousness for the elect without lapsing into fear, despair, or elitism?

What follows is not an attempt to displace classical views but to expand the theological imagination by exploring a model in which God's mercy is truly universal—but the danger of

rejecting mercy knowingly is uniquely concentrated among those who claimed to have received it already.

2. Scriptural Anchors: Judgment Proportional to Knowledge

A central feature of the *Insider-Risk Universalism* model is the claim that divine judgment is not distributed evenly, but proportionally, according to the amount of moral and spiritual knowledge a person has received. This principle is deeply rooted in Scripture—not as a marginal theme, but as a foundational element of biblical justice. In this section, we examine three key scriptural loci that shape this concept: the warning to teachers in James, the parable of stewards in Luke, and Paul's reasoning about conscience and revelation in Romans.

2.1 James 3:1 and the Burden of Teachers

James 3:1 delivers a sobering warning: *"My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation."* The term "masters" (KJV) or "teachers" (in most modern translations) denotes those who take it upon themselves to instruct others in spiritual and moral truth. James does not discourage teaching per se—his epistle is itself an act of teaching—but he cautions against entering such a role lightly, because the judgment of God intensifies in proportion to the influence and knowledge possessed.

What makes this passage remarkable is that it speaks *not to the ignorant or rebellious outsider*, but to the spiritually active insider—those who presume to lead others. Judgment, in this view, is not about general sinfulness but about the moral responsibility that comes from having and using the truth. The greater the light, the greater the weight.

In the context of universal salvation, James 3:1 suggests that salvation is not a binary inclusion/exclusion based on doctrinal alignment alone. Instead, judgment varies within the saved, according to their stewardship of knowledge. And for some—especially those who claim and misuse that knowledge—the consequences may be more intense, more refining, and more perilous.

2.2 Luke 12:48 and the Principle of Differentiated Accountability

In Luke 12:48, Jesus offers one of the clearest articulations of proportionate justice: *"For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."* The saying appears in the context of a parable about servants who either prepare for their master's return or neglect their duties. Strikingly, the

punishment in the parable is **not uniform**: those who knew and failed are punished *more severely* than those who did not know and failed.

This is a moral and eschatological calibration. Divine judgment is not the same for everyone. The standard is not a universal minimum, but a personalized measure, based on revelation received and responsibility assumed.

Applied to the "Born Again" believer, this implies a deep theological reversal: those with the most spiritual insight may incur the greatest accountability. This is not because their knowledge is false, but because it carries moral weight. Grace, in this view, is not a shield from judgment but a call to greater depth of transformation. Where awareness has been granted, superficiality, presumption, and hypocrisy are not minor infractions—they are a rejection of light itself.

2.3 Paul on Conscience, Light, and Responsibility

In Romans 2, Paul builds a theology of accountability rooted in conscience and law—but the key point is that judgment corresponds to available light. Gentiles, though lacking the Torah, are judged by the law written on their hearts. Jews, who have the law, are judged more strictly because they possess explicit revelation. Neither group escapes judgment, but each is assessed according to the knowledge they've been entrusted with.

Paul writes: *"For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law."* This forms the broader Pauline structure for differentiated judgment. The more you know, the more precise the divine audit becomes.

This logic undergirds the moral intuition behind *Insider-Risk Universalism*. If judgment varies according to moral and spiritual light, then those claiming rebirth, regeneration, and deep divine encounter may be the most thoroughly judged of all. This is not meant to instill fear, but to call such individuals into ongoing repentance, humility, and truthfulness. It also relativizes exclusive soteriology: outsiders, who never heard the gospel, may be judged gently, while insiders are judged on the terms they themselves proclaim.

In Paul's theology, God's justice is not flat; it is *responsive* to each person's interior and exterior moral situation. This becomes the scaffolding for a model of salvation in which judgment and mercy co-exist, not as opposites, but as functions of divine proportionality. And it opens the door for a vision of Hell—not as a universal threat, but as a particular peril for those who claim the most and live it least.

3. Theological Background: TULIP and Its Cracks

The acronym TULIP represents the five points of classical Calvinism: Total depravity, Unconditional election, Limited atonement, Irresistible grace, and Perseverance of the saints. It is designed as a coherent soteriological system, where each petal reinforces the others. But the hypothesis developed in this paper—that those claiming to be "Born Again" may uniquely risk final judgment within a universalist framework—puts new pressure particularly on the P: *Perseverance of the Saints*. In this section, we explore how that doctrine functions in Reformed theology, where its limits begin to show, and what theological reconfiguration becomes necessary when "saving knowledge" is turned into presumption rather than transformation.

3.1 Perseverance of the Saints and the Assumed Guarantee

Within traditional Reformed theology, Perseverance of the Saints means that those truly elected and regenerated by God will persevere in faith and good works to the end. It is often taken as a doctrine of assurance—not based on the believer's strength, but on God's unbreakable grip. This is not the same as "once saved, always saved" in its popular form; rather, it affirms that God sustains the elect such that they cannot finally fall away.

The problem arises in the *identification* of the elect. Since perseverance is not a visible, measurable quality, it becomes difficult to distinguish between the truly regenerate and those who merely profess faith. As a result, a strong doctrine of P can unintentionally breed presumption—the belief that one's status is secure by virtue of a past experience, public profession, or internal sense of election. The original intention of the doctrine was pastoral: to encourage believers who struggle with sin. But in practice, it often functions as a guarantee of outcome, especially for those who have made a confident declaration of being "Born Again."

This is the first crack. The P doctrine assumes that true election cannot fail—but if the fruits of that election are not humility, obedience, and transformation, how is it known to be real? In this ambiguity, the claim of spiritual rebirth becomes more dangerous, not less—a possible mask for self-deception.

3.2 Election, Agency, and Spiritual Presumption

The doctrine of Unconditional Election—the U in TULIP—teaches that God chooses some for salvation based entirely on His will, not on any foreseen merit or decision. While this emphasizes divine grace, it also introduces a double-bind: human agency is deprioritized, but the individual believer still interprets signs of election in their life. The experience of being "Born Again" becomes one such sign.

But if election is unconditional, and assurance is drawn from subjective experiences (e.g., a conversion moment, inner conviction, doctrinal orthodoxy), then spiritual confidence can easily become spiritual presumption. The danger is no longer merely theological—it becomes ethical and psychological. The "elect" may cease examining themselves because they believe their election makes repentance unnecessary. In such cases, the very structure of election becomes a license for moral stagnation or superiority.

Moreover, when this framework is combined with aggressive evangelism—especially within evangelical Protestantism—it creates an incentive to push for visible, rapid conversions without corresponding spiritual formation. This increases the number of people who *claim* salvation based on a narrow reading of "faith alone," without the cruciform transformation described in Scripture. The result is a community rich in profession but poor in fruit, vulnerable to the very judgment James 3:1 warns about.

3.3 What Happens When "Saving Knowledge" Is Misused?

If knowledge of salvation is a gift, then to *misuse* that knowledge is to distort the gift itself. The parables of Jesus, the prophets of the Old Testament, and the warnings of the apostles all affirm one principle: God holds accountable those who know better. This includes the religious, the teachers, the insiders.

When someone claims to be Born Again—publicly adopting the identity of one who has passed from death to life—they are implicitly claiming to have received the deepest kind of spiritual light. But what happens if that light is not loved, or worse, is used to control others, mask hypocrisy, or justify complacency?

This is the central theological tension: does claiming saving knowledge without transformation actually place one in greater danger than not knowing at all? According to Luke 12:48, it may. According to Hebrews 6:4–6, it may. According to the repeated pattern of prophetic judgment in Scripture, it often does.

Thus, the "Born Again" claim—far from being an automatic badge of election—may, under this hypothesis, become the *site of greatest judgment*. In a universalist framework where God's mercy ultimately reaches all, it is not the outsider who risks exclusion, but the insider who weaponizes grace, refuses repentance, or mistakes knowledge for holiness. If salvation is universal, then judgment is not abolished—it is reassigned to those who presumed they had already passed through it.

This reconfiguration does not undermine the Gospel; it refines it. Grace is still sovereign, but the misuse of grace becomes the most serious eschatological liability. And so the cracks in TULIP are

not in grace itself, but in the system's failure to anticipate how spiritual privilege can become a veil for presumption. This is the entry point for a new theological grammar—one that speaks of mercy for the masses and fire for the self-assured.

4. Universal Salvation Revisited

The hypothesis of *Insider-Risk Universalism* depends on a form of universal salvation—but not the sentimentalized or flattened version often caricatured in polemics. Instead, it requires a morally serious, judgment-compatible universalism, one in which the final salvation of all does not negate accountability, but redistributes it according to light received. To grasp how this can work, we must revisit what traditional universalism has claimed, what it has deliberately left ambiguous, and how the Church Fathers grounded this hope in a God who is both just and healing. We also need to examine the boundary between confident hope and metaphysical inevitability, which remains one of the most contested fault lines in Christian eschatology.

4.1 What Traditional Universalism Claims—and Omits

The classical doctrine of universal salvation—or *apokatastasis*, "restoration of all things"—affirms that God's redemptive will is not only universal in scope, but victorious in effect. All rational creatures, no matter how fallen, disordered, or resistant, will ultimately be restored to union with God. This claim has always been controversial—not just because it challenges the notion of Hell as eternal, but because it seems to limit the freedom of the creature or to reduce judgment to temporary suffering.

But rigorous forms of universalism avoid this flattening. They do not deny the reality of sin, the gravity of moral evil, or the pain of judgment. What they deny is final, unhealable estrangement. Their claim is not that salvation is easy, but that God is more persistent than our resistance.

What traditional universalism often omits—at least explicitly—is a detailed account of how long, how intense, or how personally tailored this path to restoration might be. Judgment is acknowledged, but often left vague. The danger here is a pastoral gap: if the journey to healing is unspecified, listeners may either trivialize sin or despair of mercy, depending on temperament.

The *Insider-Risk* model attempts to fill this gap by intensifying judgment precisely where knowledge is deepest. It *accepts* universal restoration, but insists that the path to that restoration is shaped by one's stewardship of spiritual light.

4.2 Patristic Precedents: Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Isaac of Nineveh

Three key early figures serve as theological scaffolding for morally serious universalism: Origen of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, and Isaac of Nineveh.

- Origen (3rd century) is often considered the fountainhead of Christian universalism. His *apokatastasis* is grounded in the belief that God's justice is always medicinal, never purely retributive. Even the devil, in Origen's system, is not beyond the reach of divine correction—though this extension became a source of later controversy. For Origen, judgment is pedagogical: souls are purified over aeons until they are capable of union with the divine.
- Gregory of Nyssa (4th century), one of the Cappadocian Fathers, is sometimes called the "father of fathers" of the Church. Though more cautious than Origen, Gregory still envisioned a final restoration in which evil is entirely purged, and all created beings are healed. His emphasis on the soul's gradual purification and the defeat of death aligns naturally with a hopeful, but rigorous, universalism.
- Isaac of Nineveh (7th century), writing from the Syriac tradition, took a more affective route. He emphasizes God's absolute mercy and argues that divine punishment is always a form of healing. Hell, in his theology, is not a place of torture inflicted by God, but a state of existential sorrow endured by those who behold divine love and are not yet prepared to receive it.

Together, these thinkers form a tradition of mercy without moral trivialization. Each affirms that God's love will ultimately overcome every resistance—but not without fire, not without truth, and not without the full moral weight of what one has done and known.

4.3 The Line Between Hope and Inevitability

One of the most contested questions in Christian theology is whether universal salvation can be asserted (dogmatically) or merely hoped for. Hans Urs von Balthasar famously framed this as *"Dare we hope that all men be saved?"*—a hope, but not a declaration. David Bentley Hart, by contrast, asserts that the salvation of all is theologically necessary, given the nature of God, the structure of freedom, and the meaning of justice.

The *Insider-Risk* hypothesis relies on hope, not inevitability, but it seeks to discipline that hope with a moral structure. It does not declare that all will be saved without exception as a metaphysical certainty. Rather, it operates within the theological gravity of *what it would take* for universal salvation to be true—and *what it would mean* if the only remaining risk was concentrated not in the outsider, but in the self-assured insider who weaponizes grace.

This boundary between hope and inevitability matters. If universal salvation is asserted too strongly, judgment risks becoming meaningless. If it is relegated to mere wishful thinking, mercy becomes provisional and anxious. The strength of the Insider-Risk model is that it holds this tension dynamically: it dares to hope, but it locates the greatest threat of delay, sorrow, and purifying fire in those who think themselves most secure.

Thus, universal salvation is not rejected—it is refined by restoring the full force of accountability to those who should know better. And that refinement, paradoxically, may be the very thing that saves universalism from itself.

5. The Exception Clause: A Theological Proposal

In this section we introduce the core claim of *Insider-Risk Universalism*: that universal salvation may apply to all people—but that the greatest risk of eschatological loss, sorrow, or prolonged purification belongs not to the outsider, but to the insider who claims spiritual rebirth without transformation. This "exception clause" does not deny God's mercy. It insists that mercy, when knowingly refused, can become the occasion of deepest judgment—not by divine abandonment, but through the soul's own disintegration in the face of rejected grace. The one who knows, but turns knowledge into superiority, is not excluded arbitrarily, but reveals a unique mode of self-condemnation.

5.1 Defining the Exception: Spiritual Knowledge Without Transformation

The exception clause arises from a very specific condition: spiritual knowledge that fails to bear fruit. The individual who proclaims being "Born Again" makes a profound theological and existential claim—that they have encountered God, experienced rebirth, and now live in the light of grace. This knowledge is not academic; it is declared as an inner ontological change. But when such a claim is untethered from humility, repentance, and moral renewal, it becomes a mask—possibly even a lie.

The exception is not triggered by ignorance, error, or weakness. It is triggered by conscious betrayal of light: when someone who claims intimate knowledge of divine mercy uses that claim to justify complacency, manipulate others, or elevate themselves above correction. The danger lies not in the failure to be perfect, but in the distortion of grace into *license*, or worse, *weapon*. In such cases, "Born Again" becomes a title of judgment, not security—not because God turns away, but because the soul has collapsed the transformative potential of grace into a static self-image.

Thus, the exception is not a counter to universal salvation, but a condition within it: the healing of all remains true, but for the self-deceiving knower, the path may be long, dark, and exacting—possibly the very thing once called Hell.

5.2 Why Rejecting Mercy Knowingly Might Be Self-Condemning

The most haunting form of judgment in Scripture is not wrath, but the sorrow of the soul that cannot receive mercy because it has closed itself to the truth of its own need. In this light, Hell is not so much God's act as ours: a refusal to be healed when healing is offered in full. Jesus' parables often center this principle—notably, the elder brother in Luke 15 who cannot join the feast of mercy because he cannot bear the thought of his sinful sibling being embraced.

To reject mercy *knowingly* is more than sin. It is a form of existential pride that builds a false identity on a half-truth: "I am already saved; therefore I do not need to be changed." This is the unique temptation of the insider—not to resist God's grace altogether, but to *contain* it within the boundaries of one's own ego. Such containment turns grace into a personal possession, rather than a divine invasion.

If salvation is about union with God, then self-condemnation occurs when the soul constructs an identity that cannot survive that union. It is not God's refusal, but ours. And when the refusal is made from a place of spiritual knowledge, it becomes deeper, more corrosive, and harder to escape. The light that should illuminate becomes unbearable, because it exposes the lie within.

This is why the exception clause is both rare and real. It suggests that judgment remains active—not to damn arbitrarily, but to burn away every falsehood that tries to stand next to mercy without being reshaped by it.

5.3 A Paradox of Enlightenment: The Light That Judges

The Book of John opens with a paradox: *"The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it."* Later, Jesus says, *"This is the judgment: that light has come into the world, and people loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil."* These are not mere poetic metaphors; they outline a spiritual law: the more clearly one sees the light, the more unbearable it becomes *if the will is not aligned with it*.

This is the paradox of enlightenment: light saves by revealing, but that same light judges by revealing. If the soul clings to lies, power, or self-image, the revelation becomes searing. The one who has heard the truth and uses it to avoid transformation has weaponized the light. That is not just error—it is tragedy.

Origen spoke of judgment as the moment when the soul sees itself in the mirror of divine purity and either runs to the truth or recoils in horror. Gregory of Nyssa suggested that purification after death could be painful not because God punishes, but because the soul, confronted with perfect love, must be broken open before it can be healed.

The "Born Again" knower who has turned grace into pride stands in exactly this tension. They may experience the light not as joy, but as torment—not because God has changed, but because they have confused *awakening* with *arrival*. Until the ego dies and the soul yields, the light will continue to judge—mercifully, relentlessly, and in proportion to how much the soul already knows.

That is the theological core of the exception clause: not exclusion from universal salvation, but a path to it that is longer, steeper, and harder for those who *should have known better*. Not because they are hated—but because they were called into deeper intimacy, and they fled when it required their undoing.

6. Implications for Repentance and Responsibility

If the *Insider-Risk Universalism* model is taken seriously—where divine mercy ultimately restores all, but judgment falls most heavily on those who presume salvation without transformation—then it dramatically reshapes the nature of repentance and spiritual responsibility. No longer can repentance be viewed as a one-time event, nor can spiritual identity function as insurance. Instead, repentance becomes a sustained moral posture—an ongoing, truth-facing humility that deepens with the amount of light one receives. In this framework, repentance is not bypassed by grace; it is demanded more urgently the closer one moves toward grace's center.

6.1 What True Repentance Entails Post-Awakening

In a post-awakening state—after a person has consciously received and claimed the light of divine grace—repentance is no longer primarily about renouncing gross wrongdoing. It is about dislodging the self from the center, about undergoing a deeper surrender of identity, control, and entitlement.

True repentance after spiritual awakening entails:

- The recognition that prior repentance was incomplete or self-serving, shaped more by fear or cultural conformity than real inner transformation.

- A relinquishing of spiritual pride, where the ego uses the identity of “Born Again” as a shield against further change.
- A willingness to be continually exposed by the light, especially when it reveals faults not previously seen—arrogance masked as zeal, control disguised as discipleship, or indifference hidden beneath doctrine.

Under this model, repentance is the soul’s response to increasing knowledge, not just guilt. The more one knows of divine goodness, the more one sees the deep structures of resistance still embedded in the will. That is why, paradoxically, the spiritually awakened person may need repentance more than they ever did before.

6.2 Moral Seriousness vs Spiritual Performance

One of the most damaging distortions in religious life is the confusion between moral seriousness and spiritual performance. The former is grounded in humility, truth, and love; the latter in visibility, certainty, and control. Spiritual performance thrives on identity—being seen as holy, wise, correct. It may involve the language of grace while resisting its substance. It creates the illusion of repentance without its cost.

The *Insider-Risk* thesis exposes this confusion with surgical clarity. It suggests that spiritual performance may be the most dangerous of all postures—not because it fails to use the name of Jesus, but because it uses it to avoid being undone by Him. Those who perform sanctity may fool others—and even themselves—but the divine light sees through posturing.

In contrast, moral seriousness manifests in:

- A refusal to self-justify, even when right.
- A hunger for correction, not praise.
- An orientation toward justice, especially for others.
- An inner trembling, not because one doubts God’s love, but because one feels the weight of carrying it before others.

This seriousness is not fear-driven. It is love-aware. It sees that to be near the holy is not a status, but a furnace.

6.3 The Temptation to Claim Certainty Without the Cross

The temptation of the spiritually awakened—especially in evangelical and charismatic circles—is to treat the *moment of awakening* as a finish line rather than an entry point. To be "Born Again" becomes a marker of certainty, an inward credential used to bypass deeper surrender.

But in the Gospels, certainty is never given to the self-assured. It is given only in the shape of the Cross. This means that authentic certainty is always cruciform: it comes through dying to one's control, embracing weakness, and following Christ into the vulnerable spaces of truth and love.

To claim certainty without the Cross is to bypass transformation. It results in:

- Certainty without compassion: where judgment of others is high, but self-awareness is low.
- Certainty without justice: where salvation is declared, but ethical formation is absent.
- Certainty without suffering: where resurrection is claimed without ever dying to self.

In the *Insider-Risk* model, this kind of certainty is not spiritually neutral—it is dangerous. It replaces pilgrimage with arrival, humility with entitlement. And it may be precisely this presumption that delays or distorts the soul's final healing—not because God withholds grace, but because the soul has built a wall of confidence where there should have been a door of surrender.

Thus, the implications for repentance and responsibility under this model are not minimal—they are totalizing. Repentance is not abolished by salvation; it is intensified. The more one knows, the more one must be willing to die. And for the one who claims to live in the light, the only safe path is to walk continually in the shadow of the Cross.

7. Christological and Pneumatological Reflections

For *Insider-Risk Universalism* to maintain both theological coherence and spiritual weight, it must not only be grounded in principles of justice and responsibility—it must also be Christological and Pneumatological at its core. In this section, we reflect on the roles of Christ and the Holy Spirit as they pertain to divine judgment, spiritual awakening, and the peril of misused grace. Christ is not merely the Savior in this model—He is also the knower of hearts, whose judgment is inseparable from love. The Holy Spirit is not a coercive force—but the one who convicts in freedom, making accountability possible without overriding agency.

7.1 The Spirit's Role in Convicting, Not Coercing

In the Gospel of John, Jesus describes the Spirit as the one who will "convict the world concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment." This verb—convict—is critical to the model of differentiated judgment. Conviction is not coercion. The Spirit does not forcibly convert or override the will. Instead, the Spirit illuminates, awakens, and exposes the truth—especially to those who have already claimed to know it.

Under this model, the Spirit is the *ethical and epistemological engine* behind insider accountability. The one who is "Born Again" has received not only grace but illumination—a form of spiritual sensitivity. If that sensitivity is ignored, dulled, or manipulated, the Spirit does not disappear—but becomes a witness against the soul's duplicity.

This kind of Spirit-work creates a dynamic of freedom under light. The Spirit does not punish, but reveals. The Spirit does not compel, but *testifies*. And because the Spirit operates in truth, the soul that knowingly avoids or distorts what has been revealed is not a passive victim, but an active agent of its own estrangement.

Thus, in this model, the Spirit's role is essential—not to guarantee salvation by force, but to make resistance morally meaningful, and therefore, judgment proportionate to awareness.

7.2 Christ as Judge Who Knows the Heart's Awareness

In many judgment texts, Christ is described not simply as a king or ruler but as one who knows the inner life of each person. This judgment is not based solely on visible behavior, but on what the person truly knows, loves, and chooses. "Man looks on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks on the heart."

In Matthew 7, Jesus declares: *"Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord' will enter the kingdom of heaven…"*—a direct challenge to those who claim to speak and act in His name without inward conformity. He ends with the chilling phrase: *"I never knew you."* These are not people who rejected Christ—they proclaimed Him. Their fault lies not in ignorance, but in performative spiritual identity without surrender.

Within *Insider-Risk Universalism*, this dimension of Christ's judgment becomes central. It is not a retributive response to unbelief, but a discerning response to claimed belief without transformation. Christ knows what the person knew, what they claimed, what they hid behind, and what they avoided. He judges not just actions but motives. And it is this depth of knowledge that enables the judgment to be just without being arbitrary, and severe without being unmerciful.

Furthermore, this Christological judgment is *healing in its fire*. Its purpose is not to destroy but to undo the self-deceptions that prevent union with God. For the insider, this undoing may be more painful precisely because they built their identity on a misused knowledge of grace.

7.3 The Danger of Blasphemy Against the Spirit Reinterpreted

One of the most enigmatic sayings of Jesus is His warning that *"blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven."* While traditionally interpreted in various ways—ranging from attributing Christ's works to demons, to terminal hardness of heart—it points to a category of sin that is especially dangerous because it resists the very source of transformation.

In this model, blasphemy against the Spirit is reinterpreted as the persistent rejection of conviction after spiritual awakening. It is not ignorance. It is not sin in weakness. It is the calculated turning away from the inner truth that the Spirit has made known. It is grace encountered and then distorted, either through presumption ("I am already saved, no matter how I live") or through hardened performance ("I will use this language of salvation to dominate, divide, or control").

This is not unforgivable because God refuses to forgive—it is unforgivable because the soul refuses to be pierced. The light has been seen and turned away from. The hand was extended and withdrawn from. The danger here is existential, not metaphysical. It is the danger of settling into an identity that is incapable of receiving grace, even though grace is always available.

Thus, in *Insider-Risk Universalism*, this is not a loophole in divine mercy—it is a warning that the deepest damnation is possible only to those who have seen the most. Not because God is more angry at them, but because they have turned grace into something unrecognizable—and only great fire can restore it.

Together, these Christological and Pneumatological reflections reaffirm that divine judgment is not abstract or externally imposed. It is an encounter with truth, mediated by the Spirit, pronounced by Christ, and received in the soul according to how much light it has welcomed—or resisted. In this model, the highest accountability falls on those closest to the light. And that, paradoxically, is the most hopeful kind of judgment: one that still offers healing, but refuses to allow spiritual performance to masquerade as spiritual maturity.

8. The Born-Again Risk: Not for the World, but the Church

If the *Insider-Risk Universalism* model is correct—if the greatest spiritual peril falls not on the world but on the self-assured faithful—then we must face a difficult reorientation. The risk of eschatological fire is not primarily reserved for those "outside the fold" but for those within the Church, particularly those who *speak*, *teach*, and *declare* salvation with boldness but without transformation. This reframes the entire moral gravity of evangelism, discipleship, and public faith. The warnings of Christ do not disappear under universal salvation—they become localized inside the community of light, where knowledge is high and responsibility deep.

8.1 Evangelism and the Weight of What We Proclaim

In many Christian traditions, evangelism is portrayed as a rescue operation: the Church pulls sinners from the flames, delivers the message of salvation, and offers the assurance of eternal life. But if judgment is proportional to knowledge, then evangelism carries moral weight not only for the hearer, but for the speaker.

Every gospel proclamation becomes a double-edged sword. To tell someone they are "saved" is not a harmless encouragement—it is a call to radical accountability. The one who delivers that message stands under its weight. The one who receives it must walk in the light now disclosed. Under this model, the act of evangelism is not the end of risk—it may be the beginning of it.

This is not a call to silence, but to sobriety. Evangelism is not simply about conveying truths, but about inviting others into a domain where light exposes, and where the *claim of knowledge* creates new responsibilities. The Church must be careful that in its zeal to declare the good news, it does not inadvertently create identities that feel secure but are unformed, identities that say "I have arrived" without having walked the road.

In other words, to tell someone they are "Born Again" without teaching them what that rebirth requires may be to place them in greater danger—not because God is waiting to punish, but because presumed knowledge without repentance hardens the soul.

8.2 Not Everyone Who Says "Lord, Lord..."

In Matthew 7:21–23, Jesus delivers one of the most unsettling eschatological verdicts in all of Scripture:

"Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven… Many will say to me on that day, 'Lord, did we not prophesy in your name…?' And I will declare to them, 'I never knew you. Depart from me, you workers of lawlessness.'"

This is not a warning to the pagan world. It is addressed to religious insiders—those who call Jesus "Lord," perform signs, teach truth, and lead others. The problem is not that they were secular or rebellious, but that they mistook activity for intimacy, performance for transformation.

Under *Insider-Risk Universalism*, this passage becomes emblematic of the exception clause. It reveals the danger of having the right language but the wrong posture, of claiming spiritual authority without the fruits of repentance. These individuals believed they were safe—and precisely that belief in their own security became the veil over their unconverted hearts.

Jesus' response—"I never knew you"—is not a rejection of effort, but of relational falseness. He does not deny their religious actions; He denies their inward union. This makes the passage a warning not against ignorance, but against spiritual self-deception.

8.3 The Narrowing Gate of Moral Clarity

Jesus' famous image of the narrow gate and the hard way (Matthew 7:13–14) is often interpreted as a warning that salvation is scarce. But under a universalist reading, the narrow gate can be re-understood as the moral clarity that grows in proportion to spiritual light. In other words, as one draws nearer to truth, the demand for integrity sharpens. The gate narrows not because God is stingy, but because the soul must now pass through the fire of unflinching honesty.

This is particularly the case for those who call themselves "Born Again." The moral gate narrows precisely because the claim of new birth entails the death of the old self. And the old self does not go quietly. The more one clings to a static spiritual identity without surrendering to its demands, the more choking and tight the gate becomes. The soul must either shrink to fit—through humility, repentance, and truth—or resist, and feel the judgment not as punishment, but as existential dissonance.

This narrowing is not a cruelty—it is the form grace takes when it must reshape what is false. For the Church, then, the call is not simply to celebrate rebirth but to honor its cost. The gate may be narrow, but it leads to life—*and the narrowing is grace in disguise*.

In this framework, the greatest spiritual danger does not lie outside the Church, but within it. Not in the sin of the world, but in the self-assured confidence of the saved who have ceased to tremble before the holiness of grace. Evangelism remains essential, but must be accompanied by a deep reverence for what light does when it is received without transformation. For not

everyone who says “Lord, Lord” is lost—but those who do may need the most radical healing of all.

9. Reconsidering Hell: As Refusal, Not Sentence

The *Insider-Risk Universalism* model challenges the classical view of Hell not by erasing judgment, but by recasting its origin. In this view, Hell is not a divine sentence imposed on an unlucky subset of humanity, but a state of resistance that arises from the soul’s own refusal of mercy—a refusal that only becomes fully possible when the soul has encountered the fullness of light. Rather than being the punishment of the outsider, Hell is understood as the prolonged purification—or existential estrangement—of the insider who clings to a false self even after grace has been fully revealed. It is not the absence of salvation, but the torment of standing near salvation without surrendering to it.

9.1 What If Hell Is Only Possible After Full Light?

This hypothesis suggests that Hell is not universally accessible; it is not the automatic destination for the sinner, the pagan, or the uninformed. Rather, it becomes truly possible only when a soul has stood in the full light of God’s mercy, has understood what is at stake, and still chooses *not to be changed*. Hell, in this sense, is not a place prepared for the wicked in general, but a spiritual condition that arises only when rejection is fully informed.

This would mean that many of those the Church has historically assumed to be in peril—those outside the Christian faith, those who never heard the Gospel, those who lived lives of moral failure—are not at risk of Hell in the classical sense. They may endure purification, sorrow, even regret. But they have not *refused* the light because they have never fully *seen* it.

By contrast, the one who claims to have been “Born Again”—who has declared the truth, taught others, publicly affirmed Christ—may be nearer to Hell than they realize. Not because God withholds mercy, but because they have *seen the mercy* and built a life that uses it without being transformed by it.

If this is correct, then Hell is not God's ultimate judgment on sin in general, but the soul’s existential consequence of misusing revealed truth.

9.2 The Justice of God as Proportionate, Not Punitive

Traditional views of Hell often lean on a punitive framework: certain sins, or failure to believe specific doctrines, result in eternal punishment as a consequence of divine justice. Critics have long struggled with the proportionality of this idea—how finite creatures could incur infinite punishment, or how moral ignorance could lead to irrevocable torment.

Insider-Risk Universalism offers a different model: God's justice is not based on external rule-breaking, but on internalized moral and spiritual light. It is proportionate to what the person has known, seen, and understood. This logic is evident in Luke 12:48—*to whom much is given, much will be required*—and in the parables of Jesus where different servants are judged according to their knowledge of the master's will.

Hell, then, is not disproportional torment for general failure. It is the precise consequence of an inward rejection of what has been graciously revealed. And for most people—including the morally broken, the ignorant, or the spiritually immature—that level of rejection is *not possible*. They are not condemned; they are *unfinished*. Only the fully informed soul, the soul standing in the presence of the Spirit's conviction, can shape a resistance strong enough to form what might be called Hell.

This reframing allows divine justice to remain serious, but not vindictive—personal, not legalistic.

9.3 The "Final No": Who Is Capable of It?

At the heart of this model lies a terrifying and paradoxical possibility: that only the enlightened can truly say no. Only those who have claimed the name of Christ, stood in the light, felt the Spirit's work, and tasted the joy of grace can make the kind of internal rejection that is not merely sin, but resistance to love itself.

This does not mean that the "Born Again" are doomed. It means they are uniquely vulnerable to a kind of spiritual crystallization, where their identity in the light becomes the very thing that shields them from deeper surrender. Their "no" is not born of ignorance, but of entitlement, ego, or fear of losing control. It is not the no of the outsider, but of the insider who refuses to die to self.

Who, then, is capable of this "final no"? The one who:

- Uses grace to justify pride
- Uses truth to dominate others

- Uses spiritual insight to avoid repentance

The “final no” is not a single moment of rejection. It is a habit of the will, a settled refusal to be changed. And it may be undone—eventually. But the longer it endures, the more it *feels* like Hell. The soul stands in the full light and says: *“I will not yield.”*

That is not a sentence. It is a sorrow.

In this model, Hell is not God’s final word—it is the echo of a soul’s resistance in the presence of mercy. It may last until the resistance is undone, and for some, that may be long indeed. But it is not retributive. It is not an arbitrary divine decree. It is the place where the light burns without yet being welcomed, where grace is present, but the will is still sealed. And only those who know the light well enough to reject it knowingly could ever stand there.

10. Conclusion: Toward a Theology of Merciful Gravity

If there is one thing *Insider-Risk Universalism* seeks to reveal, it is that salvation is not a game of exclusion, but a gravity well of mercy—pulling all toward restoration, unless one plants themselves in defiance. In this vision, the deepest eschatological risks do not belong to the unchurched, the wayward, or the misled—but to those of us who carry light. Not because God loves us less, but because truth is weightier once known, and mercy, once revealed, demands our transformation.

Like gravity, divine mercy does not need to be enforced. It is not legal; it is ontological. It pulls. It draws. It reorients. But like a body in orbit, the soul can resist through speed—through the outward centrifugal force of pride, fear, or illusion. This theology posits that while God is ever-patient, spiritual privilege carries with it the greatest eschatological danger, precisely because the pull is strongest—and the rejection more morally culpable.

10.1 Rethinking Spiritual Privilege and Eschatological Risk

In many religious contexts, spiritual enlightenment is assumed to be a form of security. One is “in,” saved, chosen, elect. Yet if what we’ve explored is true, spiritual knowledge does not lower the stakes—it raises them. The more one has seen, the more deliberate their response becomes. The person raised in the light, who preaches grace, who bears the language of salvation, is not protected by these things. They are accountable to them.

Thus, privilege becomes risk. The person who has never heard the gospel may encounter Christ in the afterlife as stranger-turned-savior. But the one who used Christ's name to justify their pride or indifference may meet Him as judge—not because Christ turns cruel, but because the self cannot endure His gaze. We must abandon the illusion that *insiders* are at less risk. The risk **is ours**, because we *know*.

10.2 Discipleship as Costly Knowledge

In this frame, to become a disciple is not to be protected from judgment, but to be formed for it. Discipleship is costly not just because it demands obedience, but because it *exposes* us. It grants us clearer knowledge, which requires truer response. As James says, "Let not many of you become teachers, knowing that we will incur a stricter judgment."

The gospel, then, is not a safety net—it is a mirror. And when we proclaim salvation, we must do so in fear and trembling—not because the gospel fails, but because it pierces first the one who speaks it. To live in the light of Christ is to undergo the judgment now, not later—to let the fire refine us before it burns.

This is not a theology of despair, but of integrity. It insists that what we claim to believe must cost us something—or else we are the ones most likely to be deceived. The false security of the "elect" is thus exposed as a spiritual performance—unless the life bears the cruciform shape of truth, mercy, and humility.

10.3 Final Remarks on Judgment, Love, and Hope

This article began with a haunting possibility: that those who know the truth most fully are also the ones most capable of rejecting it utterly. Yet that is not the final word. The last word, as always, is hope—not the hope that denies judgment, but the hope that passes through it.

God's love is not fragile. It is not overcome by sin. It is the furnace in which lies are destroyed, masks fall, and egos die. The fire of divine judgment and the warmth of divine love are the same reality seen from different angles. For those who yield, the fire is purgation. For those who resist, it is torment. But always, it burns to heal.

And so we close with a paradox: The gospel is universal, but not cheap. It is offered to all, but it demands everything. It calls every soul—especially the religious one—not just to believe, but to become. To know Christ is not merely to confess Him. It is to be changed by Him. And where that change is refused, the gospel itself becomes a judgment.

Yet even this judgment is hope in disguise. Because as long as we live, the call continues. And even after death, perhaps, the mercy does not end. The *Insider-Risk* is not a theology of

damnation. It is a theology of merciful gravity—where judgment is real, transformation is required, and love, always, has the final say.

11. References

11.1 Scriptural Citations

- James 3:1 — “Not many of you should become teachers, my brothers, for you know that we who teach will be judged with greater strictness.”
- Luke 12:48 — “Everyone to whom much was given, of him much will be required, and from him to whom they entrusted much, they will demand the more.”
- Matthew 7:21–23 — “Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven...”
- Romans 2:12–16 — Paul on conscience, the law written on the heart, and judgment according to inner light.
- 1 Corinthians 3:11–15 — Paul on works tested by fire and being saved “as through fire.”
- Hebrews 10:26–31 — A sobering passage on willful sin after knowledge of the truth.
- Matthew 25:31–46 — The parable of the sheep and goats; judgment based on deeds of mercy.
- John 12:47–48 — Jesus speaks of His words judging those who reject Him.
- Romans 11:32 — “For God has consigned all to disobedience, that He may have mercy on all.”

11.2 Patristic and Historical Sources

- **Origen of Alexandria**, *De Principiis* — Early articulation of apokatastasis (universal restoration).
- **Gregory of Nyssa**, *On the Soul and the Resurrection* — Vision of purification beyond death and divine mercy.
- **Isaac of Nineveh**, *Ascetical Homilies* — A major Eastern voice for God’s overwhelming compassion and the ultimate defeat of sin.
- **Augustine**, *Enchiridion* and *City of God* — Strong proponent of divine justice and eternal punishment, though nuanced on God’s mercy.
- **Thomas Aquinas**, *Summa Theologiae*, esp. on damnation, divine justice, and grace.

- **Martin Luther**, *The Bondage of the Will* — Pessimistic anthropology, divine sovereignty, election.
- **John Calvin**, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* — Doctrine of predestination and perseverance of the saints.

11.3 Modern Theological Works

- **Karl Barth**, *Church Dogmatics IV/1–4* — Christocentric universalism by implication, though never dogmatically asserted.
- **Hans Urs von Balthasar**, *Dare We Hope "That All Men Be Saved"?* — Permissive universalism and the logic of hope.
- **David Bentley Hart**, *That All Shall Be Saved* — Strong argument for no-exception universalism from philosophical and theological grounds.
- **Thomas Talbott**, *The Inescapable Love of God* — Argument for universal reconciliation rooted in divine goodness and justice.
- **Robin Parry** (as Gregory MacDonald), *The Evangelical Universalist* — Reframing universalism within evangelical commitments.
- **C.S. Lewis**, *The Great Divorce* — Hell as self-chosen separation, not divine imposition.
- **John Hick**, *Evil and the God of Love* — Soul-making theodicy that lends itself to universalist implications.
- **N.T. Wright**, *Surprised by Hope* — Emphasis on bodily resurrection and eschatological renewal without affirming universalism.

11.4 Universalist and Calvinist Dialogues

- **James Relly**, *Union* — Early universalist response to Calvinism.
- **Elhanan Winchester**, *Lectures on Universal Restoration* — Late 18th-century theology of final reconciliation.
- **Andrew Jukes**, *The Second Death and the Restitution of All Things* — 19th-century universalist exegesis.
- **Jonathan Edwards**, *Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God* — Classic Puritan vision of wrath and urgency.

- **R.C. Sproul**, *Chosen by God* — Modern Reformed defense of TULIP.
- **Michael Horton**, *Putting Amazing Back into Grace* — Reformed emphasis on grace, election, and perseverance.

11.5 Analytic Theology and Philosophical Sources

- **Eleonore Stump**, *Atonement* — Integrative Thomistic perspective on justice, love, and forgiveness.
- **Richard Swinburne**, *The Coherence of Theism* — Rational examination of divine goodness and freedom.
- **Marilyn McCord Adams**, *Christ and Horrors* — How God addresses radical evil and the metaphysical meaning of salvation.
- **Joshua Rasmussen**, *How Reason Can Lead to God* — Exploration of metaphysical order and moral grounding in divine reality.
- **Jerry Walls**, *Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory* — Philosophical defense of post-mortem moral growth and accountability.
- **William Lane Craig**, *The Only Wise God* — Middle knowledge and God's providential orchestration of salvation.
- **Keith DeRose**, essays on epistemic responsibility and moral luck relevant to accountability in salvation scenarios.

11.6 Denominational Statements and Representative Critiques

- **Catholic Catechism**, §§1033–1037 — Eternal punishment, hope for salvation, and God's mercy.
- **Orthodox Synod of Constantinople (2012)** — Emphasis on mystery, synergy, and rejection of dogmatic universalism.
- **Heidelberg Catechism**, Q&A 1, 26–52 — Assurance in Christ and views on final judgment.
- **Westminster Confession**, Ch. III & XXXIII — On predestination and last judgment.
- **Universalist Church of America**, historical documents (1803 Winchester Profession; 1899 unification statements).

- **United Methodist Church**, *Book of Discipline* — Evangelical commitments to grace, repentance, and future hope.
- **Vatican II**, *Lumen Gentium* §16 — Salvation of those outside visible Church and openness to God's wider mercy.

The author has published over 4,800 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.